



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,206	07/31/2003	Raymond E. Ozzie	MI103.70263US00	3320
45840 7590 07/11/2008 WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation) C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER				
ZIA, SYED				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2131				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/631,206

Applicant(s)

OZZIE ET AL.

Examiner

SYED ZIA

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment and argument filed March 28, 2008. Original application contains claim 1-42. Applicant previously amended claims 1, 5, 7-12, 14, 17-21, 34, and 40-42. Applicant currently amended claims 1, 14, 21, 34, 41, and 42. The amendment on March 28, 2008 filed have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently Claims 1-42 are pending for further consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 1-42 applicants argued that the cited prior art [Nyman et al. (2003/0037033)] “there is no indication in Nyman that a user of a device in which a naming conflict occurs is even informed of the conflict. Accordingly, there can be no indication in Nyman of user input in response to an indication of a conflict or display steps that occur based on such a user response”.

1. This is not found persuasive. The cited prior art clearly teach and describe a user-defined name distribution method in ad-hoc network, which involves storing user device address

corresponding to current user-defined name, when there is no conflict between current and already existing user-defined names. In this system when in the name distribution message corresponding to current user device address is received, then the user device address corresponding to current user-defined name is stored in a record if there is no name conflict, when comparing current user-defined name with already-existing name. The user's wireless device is accessed using the user-defined name. Thus this system provide mechanism for distributing user-defined names of user's wireless devices in ad-hoc networks e.g. piconet for collaboration of projects, games, connecting to laptop computer and other electronic devices in short range wireless system, and enables the member of the network to select the user's displayed name and address appended to the message sent by the user by reliably resolves the naming conflicts between members with the same selected device name.

As a result, cited prior art does implement and teach a system and method that manages authentication relationships ant automatically display these relationships in peer-to-peer collaboration network.

Applicants clearly have failed to explicitly identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art does teach or suggest the subject matter broadly recited in independent and dependent claims. Accordingly, rejections for Claims 1-42 are respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by Nyman et al (2003/0037033).
3. As per claims 1, 21, 41, Nyman et al. discloses a method for managing and displaying contact authentication in a peer-to-peer collaboration system wherein users may have multiple identities each with an associated display name[see fig. 1 sheet 1, 0036], on a first graphic user interface of a device [211, fig. 1, sheet 1], displaying a name conflict indicator next to a first display name[0039, fig. 2B sheet 15, 0091], that is associated with a first identity, the first identity being different than at least one second identity associated with at least one second display name, the at least one second display name being equivalent to the first display name[0039, 0096]; in response to user input associated with the name conflict indicator, displaying on the device a plurality of display names that are equivalent to the first display name[fig. 2B sheet 15, 0091, 0105]; receiving user input from a user of the device selecting an alternative display name for a selected display name, the alternative display name being selected from the plurality equivalent display names, the selected display name being associated with a

selected identity and being different than the first display name; and identifying on a second graphic user interface of the device the selected identity with the alternative display name, the second graphic user interface

providing a function related to controlling communication within a peer-to-peer collaboration system the communication being between the device and a second device associated with the selected identity [see fig. 1 sheet 1, 0036, 0096, fig. 2B].

4. As per claim 2, Nyman et al. discloses computing a clean name from each display name and comparing clean names of two display names to determine if the two display names are equivalent [0138-0139].

5. As per claims 3, 23, Nyman et al. discloses each contact identity has an authentication level associated therewith, examining the authentication levels of all display names that are equivalent[0094]; and displaying name conflict indicators next to selected display names based on the examination[0094, 0096].

6. As per claims 4, 24, Nyman et al. discloses displaying a name conflict indicator next to each display name(fig. 2B sheet 15) associated with a contact identity whose authentication level is less than the highest authentication level of all contact identities with equivalent display names[0094, 0096].

7. As per claims 5, 25, Nyman discloses determining the behavior of the collaboration system regarding communications with a contact based on a security policy and the authentication level of that contact [0094].

8. As per claims 6, 26, Nyman discloses receiving from a user of the collaboration system input specifying the security policy [0093-0094].

9. As per claims 7, 27, Nyman discloses receiving from a system administrator input specifying the security policy [0094, 0096].
10. As per claims 8, 28, Nyman discloses warning a user based on the security policy when that user attempts to communicate with a contact having a predetermined authentication level [0094].
11. As per claims 9, 29, Nyman discloses preventing a user from communicating with another user based on the security policy when the other user has a predetermined authentication level [0094, 0096].
12. As per claims 10, 30, Nyman discloses displaying a dialog box having all display names that are equivalent to the selected display name listed therein [0039, fig. 2b sheet 15].
13. As per claims 11, 31, Nyman discloses assigning an alias to one of the first and second display names which alias is not equivalent to either of the first and second display names and which alias replaces the one display name [fig. 2b sheet 15, 0105, 0138-0139].
14. As per claims 12, 32, Nyman discloses displaying an authentication indicator next to a display name that is not equivalent to another display name, which authentication indicator displays the authentication level of the associated contact [0094, 0096].
15. As per claim 13, 33, Nyman discloses each contact can have one of a predetermined number of authentication levels and wherein the authentication indicator that is displayed is unique to one of the authentication levels [0094, 0096].
16. As per claims 14, 42, Nyman discloses managing and displaying contact authentication in a peer-to-peer collaboration system wherein users may have multiple authentication certification levels, including an unauthenticated and uncertified level, setting a security policy that controls

the behavior of the collaboration system based on the authentication and certification level [0094, 0096], receiving from a user thorough a graphic user interface on a display an identification of a selected contact with which to communicate[0078-0079]; obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact; presenting on the display information constituting a warning the user and restricting the user from communicating with the selected contact based on the security policy when the selected contact has an unauthenticated and uncertified level[0027, 0093].

17. As per claim 34, Nyman discloses a mechanism that sets a security policy that controls the behavior of the collaboration system based on the authentication and certification level[0094, 0096]; means for receiving through a graphic user interface on a display an indication of a selected contact with which to communicate[0078-0079]; means for obtaining the authentication and certification level of the selected contact; a mechanism that presents on the display information constituting a warning to the user and restricts the user from communicating with the selected contact based on the security policy when the selected contact has an unauthenticated and uncertified level based on the security policy[0027, 0093].

18. As per claims 15, 35, Nyman discloses a user setting the security policy that applies to that user [0093-0094].

19. As per claims 16, 36, Nyman discloses a system administrator setting a security policy that applies to a user [0094, 0096].

20. As per claims 17, 37, Nyman discloses warning a user when the security policy is set to warn the user when attempts to communicate with an unauthenticated and uncertified contact [0027, 0093].

21. As per claims 18, 38, Nyman discloses preventing a user from communicating with an uncertified contact when the security policy is set to restrict and the user attempts to communicate with an uncertified contact[0027, 0093-0094, 0096].
22. As per claims 19, 39, Nyman discloses allowing a user to communicate with an unauthenticated and uncertified contact when the security policy is set to allow without warning and the user attempts to communicate with an unauthenticated and uncertified contact[0093-0094, 0096].
23. As per claims 20, 40, Nyman discloses compiling a contact list of contacts with whom the user is attempting to communicate [0022]; checking the contact list to determine contacts that are not authenticated; checking the unauthenticated contacts to determine whether a certification policy applies to any unauthenticated contact; and placing an unauthenticated contact on the list of unauthenticated and uncertified contacts when no certification policy applies to that contact[0027, 0093-0094].
24. As per claim 22, Nyman discloses means for displaying a name conflict indicator [fig. 2b sheet 15] includes a mechanism that computes a clean name from each display name and a comparator that compares the clean names of two display names to determine if the two display names are equivalent [0138-0139].

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED ZIA whose telephone number is (571)272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sz

June 25, 2008

/Syed Zia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2131